



Trans-Lake Washington Project

Washington State Department of Transportation Sound Transit

Points Communities Design Workshop – Executive Summary

A community design workshop for the Points communities, including Medina, Hunts Point, Clyde Hill, and Yarrow Point, was held on April 24, 2002, from 4:00 until 7:30 p.m. at Medina Elementary School. The purpose of the workshop was to update the community on the status of the Trans-Lake Washington Project and to solicit community feedback on the following issues:

- Noise mitigation
- Community enhancements, including lids
- Roadway alignment through Points communities
- Pedestrian/bicycle opportunities

Over one hundred people attended the workshop. For a list of participants and project team in attendance, please see Appendix C. The original invitees were selected based on the proximity of their business, property, or residence to the SR 520 corridor. Approximately forty-five invitations were distributed electronically or by mail. Each invitee who did not respond to the invitation was contacted by phone the day prior to the workshop to remind them of the event.

After the introduction of the project team, including representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation, Sound Transit, and consultants, participants were provided a report of the project's status and objectives for the workshop. This was followed by a general question and answer period. Workshop participants then broke into smaller groups and were directed to three working stations. Each station was focused around one of the major issues and staffed by project team members. Attendees were encouraged to ask questions and give feedback on the issues by talking with staff, marking on existing interchange diagrams, and filling out comment forms.

Major themes resulting from the general discussion, workstation sessions, and written comments, were as follows:

- ✓ In general, participants would like an expansion in the size of the proposed lids. Most would like to see the lid surface used as park space.
- ✓ Some participants would like to see a mid-lake high-rise to lower the touchdown on the east shore.
- ✓ Most participants see Evergreen Point Road as the most important flyer stop to their community.
- ✓ In general, participants were supportive of the increased bicycle/pedestrian connections. Some participants would like to see the Points bicycle/pedestrian system kept separate from the regional trail system.
- ✓ Most participants supported the I-5/SR-520 and I-405/SR-520 interchange improvements. Some participants would like to see those changes addressed prior to work beginning on SR 520.
- ✓ All participants would like to see a separate discussion regarding property acquisition and mitigation.

Points Communities Design Workshop – Summary

Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Objectives

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, introduced the project team to the community, including representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Sound Transit (ST).

The purpose of the community design workshop was to relate the current status of the project, discuss the current and evolving design process, and to obtain input from the community regarding unresolved design issues. The format of the workshop was as follows:

- Outline of outstanding alternatives design issues; opportunity for clarifying questions
- General question and answer session
- Roundtable workshop sessions to provide feedback on drawings, maps
- Closing question and answer session

Outline of Outstanding Alternatives Design Issues

Les Rubstello, WSDOT, related that the project team members present at the workshop are those responsible for designing the interchanges for each of the project's alternatives. Input was sought from workshop participants, specifically on the six and eight lane alternatives.

The project is directed by the 22-member Executive Committee, which includes the four mayors of the Points communities. The Executive Committee recommended to WSDOT and Sound Transit that a 4-lane, 6-lane, and 8-lane alternative, should proceed into the environmental impact statement (EIS). Besides examining the three alternatives, a "no action" alternative will be considered in the EIS. Each will be analyzed as separate alternatives and their impacts disclosed. The EIS does not take funding into account and therefore does not guarantee that there is money to eventually build the project.

Since January 2002, the project team has been working to define the details, such as transit access and lid locations. These are not easy decisions to make. The project team has met with the mayors of the Points communities to discuss these issues, most recently on April 15, 2002.

The current funding for the project will be spent between now and December 2002. Both the statewide vote in November 2002, and a regional vote within the next year, will determine future project funding. If both pass within the next year, the floating bridge could be constructed in late 2005 or 2006. However, the limited funding available between now and the end of the year may prevent the project team from beginning to write the EIS until 2003.

Les outlined the outstanding design issues for community input:

1. Transit access, flyer stop location, park and ride lots
2. Confirmation of interchange designs
3. Potential lid locations and neighborhood connectivity opportunities
4. Results of new noise monitoring stations
5. Stormwater management options

6. Update on east shore touchdown and alignment

General Discussion

The group elected to continue with a general question and answer period rather than breaking into smaller working groups. After approximately 90 minutes, the attendees took a dinner break and circulated among three workstations:

1. Noise mitigation
2. Roadway alignment through Points communities
3. Pedestrian/bicycle opportunities

Each station contained maps and drawing of the Points communities and was staffed by project team members who answered questions and recorded comments. A full listing of comments from the workstations can be found in Appendix A. Following the break, the group reassembled for a second question and answer session. Pat Serie facilitated both discussions, in which Les Rubstello responded to the following inquiries and comments. Please note, comments and questions have been listed by subject categories:

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

- Has the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) specifically asked the project to include the “do nothing” alternative in the EIS? *Law requires the no action alternative be analyzed in an EIS.*
- Will the EIS be several documents? *The EIS will be one document that contains analysis of four alternatives (no action, 4-lane, 6-lane, and 8-lane). The impacts of each alternative in sixteen different areas (sixteen chapters) will be described.*
- The EIS containing all three alternatives seems expensive. *The recommendation by the Executive Committee was to analyze all three alternatives.*

COSTS/FUNDING

- Was the project motivated by cost constraints? *The Executive Committee has yet to recommend that funding constraints be considered in looking at alternatives.*
- If costs are no object, why have we not been shown a lid similar to Mercer Island? Furthermore, why are larger lids not being considered? *Because items such as larger lids and tunnels, which were considered earlier in the project, cost billions and billions of dollars. The Executive Committee recommended that they not be considered further. What about tolls? In 1995, the legislature directed WSDOT to look at privately funding transportation projects. It was discovered that the public was not supportive of tolled highways. The department and regional decision makers are moving carefully to reintroduce the idea. The project team has been directed to do some studying of tolls. What people are willing to pay for tolls is a very small amount of the piece that is necessary to pay for this project. Even with tolls, we would still be asking for additional taxation.*
- SR 520 was paid off ahead of schedule because of tolls. Why wouldn't this happen again? *The original bridge cost millions of dollars. The Trans-Lake Washington Project would require billions. The Tacoma Bridge has a \$3.50 toll each way. This project is conceivably 10 times as expensive. People are not willing to pay that much.*

- The State Transportation Commission has told us that we will have tolls. The Tacoma Narrows Bridge project has been delayed by people fighting tolls. Are you prepared to go through that? There will be a battle.

DESIGN

- Why did you not come in here with a plan that looked liked Mercer Island? We are all going to fight this battle.
- What impact will the Points communities have on the decision? *On certain design issues, such as locations of flyer stops, we will strongly consider your input.*
- Flyer stops are not the guts of the problem. Colors, etc. do not count.
- The plans are interesting and directionally correct, but I have concerns. Mercer Island is a great example. None of the homework has been done. We all could have saved time, if you had come prepared with a proposal.
- I do not think most of us believe without major work on I-405 and I-5, this project will make a difference. What is the sense of making SR 520 wider, if it runs into congestion on both ends? *For the 6-lane and 8-lane alternatives, the I-5 Mercer weave is eliminated. In addition, two HOV connections on the east side have been created. The proposed new connections at I-405 and I-5 work together and increase capacity. For the 8-lane alternative, other improvements have been made to accommodate additional general purpose traffic.*
- These improvements sound like they make sense with or without this project. *The project agrees. If the Trans-Lake Washington Project goes away, these improvements [listed above] could still happen.*
- Why can't the improvements to I-5 and I-405 happen first to see how it works? *Neither one of those interchanges are the bottleneck that disrupts the flow across Lake Washington. This is the problem we are trying to solve. It is the width of the bridge that is causing the problem.*
- King County did a study awhile back that showed 60 percent of the cars coming from the north go down I-405, across the SR 520 bridge, and south on I-5. You are still going to have people doing this.
- What can you tell us about the grade of the roadway? *From Evergreen Point road to the east the grade will remain the same. The grade will not become steeper from Evergreen Point road to the bridge.*
- Have you looked at lowering SR 520? *We looked at it, but we are keeping the grade moderate because the bridge goes over the shipping channel. There will be some lowering at 92nd.*
- How does light rail fit in with SR 520? *The option for light rail is being preserved for SR 520 by recommendation of the Executive Committee. We will make sure that the bridge we build can be widened in the future to accommodate light rail.*
- Right now we can get on at 92nd and off at 84th. The proposed interchange diverts this route and then we are slowed by a series of stoplights. This interchange will take a great deal of the traffic that would get on at 92nd and off at 84th. It will add to the commute. *Currently, if you are going from the freeway to Bellevue Square, you get on eastbound SR 520. There is a free right turn that takes you south on Bellevue Way. Instead of a right turn on Bellevue Way, you will have to proceed south. Les Rubstello has asked the*

engineering staff to look into keeping the free right turn. Free right turns are not done in cities any longer because they are considered pedestrian unfriendly.

- *It appears that at 92nd, the westbound off-ramp is very close to the outlet of Points Drive East. Will that be the proposed placement of the off-ramp for 6 or 8 lanes? We will try to keep that separation no less than what it is today.*
- *Keep the regional bicycle path on the south side of the freeway. The project is proposing a regional trail. We have heard that the Points communities would like to keep their trail separate from the regional system. The trails may be combined for a short distance. It may come down to taking a house versus separating the trails.*
- *Could you have two trails with one on top of the other? Yes, this can be done.*

BOATS/DRAWSPAN

- *Is it a firm decision that the drawspan will be taken out of the middle of the bridge? Yes. It is only used four times per year.*
- *What kind of boats are we opening the bridge for? There are barge mounted cranes and a large sailboat.*
- *Will boats be able to go on the west side of the bridge or are we going to find more boats being re-routed? There will be an eastern high-rise. The Coast Guard said the drawspan could be removed, if a 72-foot clearance is provided for. The east side was chosen.*
- *Why didn't you put the clearance in the middle of the lake? You move the noise away from both shores. We felt this would impact views for the majority of the lake.*
- *Have you talked to the U.S. Congress to waive the Coast Guard regulation that requires the eastern high-rise? I would like to see a waiver of this requirement, possible in the form of rider. No, we have not asked.*

KIRKLAND/SANDPOINT BRIDGE

- *Is there an alternative to locate the bridge somewhere else? No. A 47-member study committee made that decision early on in the process.*
- *The City of Medina has requested that you include the north lake route, but you refuse to do that. Are you going to let political people tell you what to do? Trying to make a political concept a workable design will not solve the problem. We are not looking at the Kirkland/Sandpoint Bridge. The bridge would require a loss of 1,000 homes. The impact to north Seattle and Kirkland was beyond what was equitable. The project has received a recommendation by the Executive Committee not to pursue the bridge.*
- *I travel SR 520 four times a day. I have kept close track of traffic. Most of the traffic is coming from the north, off I-405. We, in Medina, have suffered from pollution and noise these last years. Leave us alone – leave the bridge. Build a bridge up north.*
- *You mentioned that the north bridge was eliminated because 1,000 homes would be taken. I have to believe by 2030, even if you have an 8-lane bridge, the traffic problems will be just as bad or worse. Is this our long-term solution? Neither the 6-lane or 8-lane will eliminate all congestion, however, they will make some improvements in travel time and how many people can move across the lake.*

LIDS/NOISE WALLS

- *Why isn't the project lowering the roadway and building a half-mile lid? There is a long history of lid discussion with this project. We started off looking at tunnels, which were*

screened out by the Executive Committee. Presently, we are looking at a roadway with three lids, approximately 400 to 500 feet. We have heard that the roadway should be lidded in its entirety and put underground. We did an analysis of it and the Executive Committee recommended that we not continue to look at it. On Mercer Island, there is a whole series of landscaped bridges. If you go beyond the 400 to 500-foot range, ventilation is required. In this topographic area, it is more difficult to construct a lid.

- *The same Executive Committee that determined the unacceptable result [eliminating the north bridge concept] decides the lid issue? Why should we accept this? There is a lack of integrity in the process. What we really want [north bridge] has already been eliminated from this process? Yes, the Executive Committee makes recommendations to WSDOT and Sound Transit. If you use the I-90 model, there are places on I-90 that do not have lids. It has been very nicely done with landscapes and noise walls. The project is able to construct an urban freeway with low impact – quieter than it is today – even with making it wider. Presently, stormwater is not treated. This will be fixed. The SR 520 corridor will be a better place to live alongside.*
- *The federal government provided the money for the lids on I-90. Will there be any federal grants to add additional lids? I-90 was an interstate, so it received federal funds. There is no interstate funding available for SR 520. A fixed amount of federal funding comes into the state each year. Even if the project puts in for a federal grant, if received, the money would be taken from some other project in the state. The department is looking for every bit of money it can find. There are supporters of every project. Patty Murray is in a very influential place and has directed where the money has been spent.*
- *Governor Gary Locke was in Washington D.C. trying to get grants for transit. The projects you ask us to fund. Was he checking on lids for this type of project? I do not know why Gov. Locke was in Washington D.C. I assume on behalf of Sound Transit. I am sure WSDOT people in Olympia, Washington, are aware. I am responsible for the design of this project. The department has permanent lobbyists in Washington D.C.*
- *It is interesting that the biggest proponent of the I-90 lids is opposed to this lidding. We are very concerned with stormwater. Is it realistic to expect the lids to be expanded? The Executive Committee could make a recommendation to look at larger lids, but WSDOT and Sound Transit will still need to consider that recommendation.*
- *How do you determine how much noise will be generated? There are computer models that tell us with each road size how much noise is generated. Noise walls are put in specific locations and the model tells us how much noise levels will be lowered with those walls. There will be some tradeoffs between noise and views. WSDOT and Sound Transit will look to the community for input on this issue.*
- *Is it possible to target the use of toll money towards lids? It is possible for tolls to be designated.*
- *If a flyer stop is a source of noise, we would like to see it mitigated by lids or located away from homes.*

PROPERTY

- *Thanks for being here. What is the process for buying out homeowners? How does this affect their property values here today? Also, how are you going to arrive at purchase prices? Federal law created in the 1960s governs purchasing property. It is a rigorous process. Once the Executive Committee recommends the alternative we can draw the*

lines on maps where the roadway may go, but we cannot do anything without funding. Once a preferred alternative is selected, we will still need to wait for construction funding.

- *What if you need to sell now? The state can do a hardship acquisition. This can only happen once we have the funding.*
- *How are the values assessed? The state sends out a right-of-way negotiator to determine the market value of the house without the bridge. The state makes an offer. A negotiation may take place. If there is a significant separation of ideas, it may go to court.*
- *Define an “affected home.” A piece of property where we would need to purchase some land, but not enough to purchase the entire house.*
- *Even if you do not purchase our property – we are still affected.*
- *Does the state compensate property owners for changing the environment that you live in while not directly “taking” your residence? Very seldom. The landowner would have to go to court and prove that there has been a change in value.*
- *If the new bridge is moved north, what happens to the swath of land once the bridge is moved? What is the procedure? I am unsure. I think that it would first be offered to the original owner. If that person were uninterested, it would likely be turned over to the city to use at its discretion, such as a park.*
- *I am within days of closing on our house. I may lose my money. Can I get information now on how it will affect this purchase, this neighborhood? We can describe everything to you verbally regarding noise and traffic impacts. We cannot talk about funding or cost. We can tell you how close your home will with the 4-lane, 6-lane, or 8-lane alternative. We cannot do a value assessment at this point in the process.*

DECISION-MAKING

- *Was the 47-member a representative body? Yes, the study committee was composed of elected officials and community representatives from the region.*
- *Is there a pre-determined decision between 4, 6, or 8 lanes? There is no predetermined answer. The Executive Committee will make a recommendation to WSDOT and Sound Transit. The leading alternative is most likely 6 or 8 lanes because no one wants to go through this effort for 4 lanes. FHWA wants the least environmentally damaging alternative. This type of analysis is usually done with the placement of a road given limited choices. For this project, it is not the same road. As you make it bigger, the performance changes. The 8-lane alternative carries twice as many cars as the 4-lane alternative. The EIS will not be making the decision based on cost versus benefit. That decision will be separate. There are various opinions on the Executive Committee on this issue.*
- *Before anyone should be asked to decide, there should be some understanding of the traffic benefit? We projected out to 2020 and completed a traffic analysis. This study was provided to all committees. A traffic study for 2030 will be part of the EIS. With the exception of the 8-lane alternative, there was not a substantial increase in moving people across the lake without using transit. In 2030, 8-lanes provides for a 15-minute commute during rush hour between 124th and I-5 compared to today.*
- *The four Points communities have a fractional vote on the Executive Committee. Do you worry that you will be challenged legally regarding the north crossing? The department*

has been following the letter of the law very carefully. The state attorney general's office is very careful to follow the letter and spirit of both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA).

- Where can a find a list of who sits on the Executive Committee? *The project website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/translake*

CONSTRUCTION

- What construction mitigation, such as ground shaking, noise, traffic impacts, has been discussed? *Construction mitigation will be a chapter in the EIS. City streets are governed by local decisions. In discussion with the mayors, the project has suggested building noise walls first to shield communities from construction noise, possibly a few years before road construction begins. It is still on the table.*
- What will be done to the old bridge? *All of the bridge structures from Medina to Montlake get torn down and taken away. The bridge will be broken up into separate pontoons and sold.*
- Last summer, sidewalks were put in on one side of 84th. For four months, there were a number of people who were disrupted in their daily routines. This interruption took place several times per day. We are an isolated community. In the building phase, is there a consistent way to mitigate on a daily basis? *It is reasonable to require that all material hauling be done through freeway, not local streets. We can do this without forcing the costs too high. We recognize that minimizing community disruption is important.*

The following action items resulted from the discussion:

- The majority of participants requested that a separate meeting be held to discuss property acquisition.
- Some participants requested an illustration of uses for the land that remains, if the new bridge is moved north.
- In general, participants would like to see pictures, such as landscaping, of the outskirts of the freeway.
- Some participants requested that the project team further investigate a high-rise in the middle of Lake Washington as opposed to the east side.
- Most participants would like to see a better description of the tradeoffs between noise walls/lids versus views.
- Some participants would like to see the “free right” on Bellevue Way remain with all alternatives.
- A participant requested that the project team inquire about a waiver of the Coast Guard regulation to maintain a 70-foot high-rise over Lake Washington.

Closing Remarks

Pat Serie adjourned the workshop by saying the project team is committed to return to the community to respond to the issues raised in the discussions. The summary will be made available on the Trans-Lake Washington Project website, as well as e-mailed to those who have provided their e-mail address.

For written comments, not part of the workshop dialogue, please see Appendix B.

Appendices

Appendix A, Workstation Public Comments

WORKSTATION 1: NOISE/LIDS

- Address the intermediate nature of noise
- Who is the state right-of-way expert?
- Concern over fair market value
- Request documentation defining affected properties and a timeline of the decision-making process
- Will there be a new entrance on Evergreen Point road? Concerned over an increase in traffic.
- Consider neighborhood security with people moving through on bicycle/pedestrian path.
- Consider the consequences removing 'decade' trees presently in corridor.
- Tell us what you the outside of a sound wall will look like.
- Show trees on outside of sound wall.
- Tell us where the hydroplane race traffic will move.
- If land is taken from Fairweather Park, will it be given elsewhere?
- Provide amenities, similar to Mercer Island.
- Provide information about transitioning property owners who are slated for relocation
- Mitigation of compression brake noise?
- Keep right-of-way land for transit, preferably rail, once the bridge has been relocated.
- Provide the Wetherill Nature Preserve with detail on lidding at 92nd 4000 – 95th NE Yarrow Point 98004.
- Show locations of sound walls.
- Eliminate “noisy” joints in the new bridge.
- Will noise walls dampen mid-span noise?

WORKSTATION 2: ROADWAY ALIGNMENT THROUGH POINTS COMMUNITIES

- Create a high-rise in the center of Lake Washington and lower touchdown on both ends.
- Make it like the Mercer Island lid.
- Provide usable space on top of the lids.
- Lower the east side touchdown of the bridge, allowing Evergreen Point to be more easily lidded. Locate the high point of the bridge offshore and make in wide enough for a shipping channel.
- Whatever you build will be filled – 4, 6, or 8-lanes.
- Prevent people from cutting through 84th to get to downtown Bellevue
- Make HOV 2-person (not 3+) to get folks off freeway at 92nd (west bound).
- Pursue fixing I-405 and I-5 prior to working on SR 520. It may eliminate the problem. Otherwise the project will not get support on the ballot measure
- Ensure that east side commuters have equal representation/vote on the Executive Committee.
- Reevaluate the solution for passage of only four ships per year. Is this justified?
- Think about the impact of raising the Evergreen Point Bridge by 8 feet. Commuters feel disempowered.

- Separation between freeway bicycle path and exiting local park (worried about children interacting with commuter bikers)
- Where is mass transit in all of this? Why study 8-lanes?
- Drawings of bridge pontoons

WORKSTATION 3: PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE

- Leave the park and ride
- Coordinate with Metro to ensure school bus stops/routes are near paths.
- Provide parent drop-off for custom school buses using transit stops
- Consider just fixing I-5/I-405 interchanges.
- Concerned about looking up at a steeper/higher SR 520 road way
- Challenge the engineers to come up with quieter solutions, specifically the junction over the roadway to the bridge is very noisy.
- Plan Sound Transit HCT into structure right now.
- Will there be a new entrance at Evergreen Point Way?
- Concern over losing Mt. Rainier view at 84th Ave.
- How much of Fairweather Preserve will be taken?
- What is a flyer stop?
- Why move SR 520 north?
- Preserve views at Evergreen Point Way by keeping the roadway as low as possible.
- Consider bridge lighting at night.
- Consider wetland impacts. Do not put another trail through the Wetherill Preserve.
- Consider noise for residents at Evergreen Point Way, uphill from structure.
- Keep the land from SR 520's previous location for future HCT addition.
- What are the plans for the Fairweather pedestrian overpass?
- Where would flyer stops be located?
- Leave flyer stop at Evergreen Point Way
- Notify property owners that may be relocated.
- Keep park and rides – people use them
- Use trail, north side of Hunts Point, as emergency vehicle access. Look at whole design from an emergency preparedness standpoint.
- Put bicycle/pedestrian on south side of SR 520 between Bellevue and Evergreen for commuters – cross water at Bridge
- Ensure safety of students who rely on the transit service for school. Opposed to underground, closed-off, or “invisible” Metro stops.
- Prefer Evergreen Point flyer stop

Appendix B, Written Comments

Comment Form Format:

Noise/Lids

1. Which lid location provide the most community connectivity and why?
2. What type of amenities do you envision on the lid surface?
3. How does the existing noise information translate into mitigation opportunities for you? Are noise walls in the proposed locations an acceptable mitigation approach to you?

Roadway alignment through Points communities

1. Balancing both local and regional needs, would you make and changes to the proposed eastside alignment and connection to the new floating bridge?
2. What changes, if any, would you make to the interchange configurations?
3. Do you have reactions or suggested changes to the proposed flyer stop locations?
4. Which of the following flyer stop location is most important to your community? Why?
-Evergreen Point Road - 92nd Avenue NE - Bellevue Way NE

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. What other pedestrian/bicycle connections should be included as part of the project?

Other Comments?

Comment #1

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. The bicycle/pedestrian 520 trail needs to be on the South side!

Other Comments

The “points loop trail” must be a separate entity from the “Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail” that is proposed by 520 expansion.

Comment #2

Noise/Lids

1. The % grade from 84th to Evergreen Point Rd. is where much of the noise comes from – this whole area must be lidded or else the noise will “blare” out the part that is not covered!
2. Natural landscaping
3. They would need to be landscaped inside and out heavily to avoid the sound “bouncing” around inside.

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. What is happening to the Points Loop Trail?

Other Comments

What is happening the “Hunts Point Traffic Circle”?

Comment #3

Other Comments

NO. Fix: (1) Alaskan Way Viaduct, (2) I-405/I-167, (3) I-5

Comment #4

Noise/Lids

2. Park

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. What is access to the current trails for residents of the towns and access for new trails from our towns? Have we lost our town trail by the new 520 project? Can we prevent access by Redmond to Seattle pedestrians/bicycle traffic into our Towns?
-

Comment #5

Other Comments

I feel that to ever study the 8 lane alt. is a complete waste of time and money. Even if it gets voted through Medina and Montlake communities will tie it up with legal wrangling forever so that nothing will happen and the time and money will be completely wasted.

Comment #6

Noise/Lids

1. Family of four use Evergreen Point bus stop to get to work and University of Washington
2. Parkland
3. Yes

Roadway alignment through Points communities

4. Evergreen Point Road

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Enlarge lid near Fairweather Nature Preserve
-

Comment #7

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. I have heard that the bikers and walkers on the MI bridge find it an unsavory experience – noisy, windy, dirty, flying pebbles, etc, etc. and they don't do it often. Perhaps it should be eliminated – saves width and impact. I rarely see the lane being used on the MI bridge.
-

Comment #8

Noise/Lids

1. Want bus stop at Evergreen Point Road (76th Ave) location
2. Park like
3. Make as quiet as possible for people to North of 520

Roadway alignment through Points communities

4. Evergreen Point Road – live close to this – will create problems if at another location

Other Comments

Make Evergreen (76th Ave) lid longer towards Hunts Point

Comment #9

Other Comments

How long will the 520 corridor be closed during construction? Can I-90 and alternative routes handle the overflow?

Comment #10

Noise/Lids

1. Evergreen Point
2. Park
3. Yes

Roadway alignment through Points communities

4. Evergreen Point Road – live there

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Wherever is possible

Other Comments

I take the buses to BCC

Comment #11

Roadway alignment through Points communities

4. No parking on Evergreen Point For bus people
-

Comment #12

Noise/Lids

1. At Evergreen Point Rd.
2. Park - lots of trees
3. No lids

Roadway alignment through Points communities

1. Do some sound lids out onto the lake to prevent large noise problems on Evergreen Point
2. Do not take any more land north, go south in future.
4. Evergreen Point Road

Other Comments

Retain unused right of ramp for future transit (old 520 Bridge East touch down)

Comment #13

Noise/Lids

1. Provide full lids (Red and green) 6 lane
2. Park
3. Use non-reflective walls

Roadway alignment through Points communities

3. Keep as many of present flyer stops as possible. Evergreen point is NOT NEGOTIABLE.
4. Evergreen Point Road – must have at Evergreen Point

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Need to keep pedestrian bridge from school to Fairweather Park.

Other Comments:

Use this option (drawing) at Evergreen Point Rd. to keep road profile as flat as possible.

Comment #14

Noise/Lids

1. The lid should begin at Lake Washington and continue without interruption at least to 96th Avenue N.E., regardless of cost. This structure will last 50 years; it should be done right.
2. City Halls, fire station, police stations, green space, parks, ball fields
3. Not an acceptable approach. Noise walls do nothing to reduce the amount of emission solids settling in my lungs and onto my home.

Roadway alignment through Points communities

1. Lid would preserve existing structure and present dislocation

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Should have an arid car pullout in the middle of the bridge
-

Comment #15

Noise/Lids

1. 550' or larger
2. Textured, designed, ivy, landscaping
3. Yes, if combined with proposed 500' lids

Roadway alignment through Points communities

1. none
2. none
3. ok as proposed
4. Evergreen Point road – good for sports events – easy access

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Have bicycle trail on south side from Yarrow Point Lid to Evergreen Point Lid. Provides adequate room for loop trail system on north side. Also avoids penetration into Wetherill Nature Preserve.

Other Comments:

Comment #16

Noise/Lids

1. We need the bridge lowered at the ends not raised. The bridge should be raised in the middle for boat traffic not the ends.
2. The nature of our points communities is a major reason many of us moved here. We need major advanced landscaping on lids and sound wells
3. I believe a number of houses will be greatly affected by the sound wells/lids and construction. Many more then you have indicated, and we need a new meeting addressing those needs.

Roadway alignment through Points communities

1. Hunts Point would like a separation between the local trail and the large bicycle path.
2. I loved the changes in the I-405 and I-5 connections. I believe this needs to be done no matter how many lanes on 520.

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Expand the Kirkland park and Ride and add another location to promote Park and Ride.

Other Comments

I believe that we do not need to study 8 lanes. It is a waste of time and money and energy, Medina – Montlake will never let it pass. I believe we need to study more MASS TRANSIT.

Comment #17

Roadway alignment through Points communities

1. Keep the bridge in the same space and only 4 lanes. 405 is crowded enough.
-

Comment #18
Other Comments
NO!

Comment #19
Noise/Lids

1. Evergreen Point Station. I commute from there to work.
2. Park
3. Keep it as quiet as possible particularly to the north

Roadway alignment through Points communities

4. Evergreen Point Road – it is by far the most convenient

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Sound proof walkway between Evergreen Pt and Yarrow Point

Other Comments
I enjoy riding my bike

Comment #20

Roadway alignment through Points communities

1. I see a huge problem with eastbound traffic from Seattle exiting at 84th to go to Bellevue Sq. Same problem in reverse only partially answered with proposed streamlining of Bellevue Way/520 Interchange.
-

Comment #21

Noise/Lids

1. A total lid from Lake Washington to at least Bellevue Way is the only answer. Anything less will not do the job and we will not support this project.
3. NO! Lid only. Lets get creative. Deepen the new highway, lid it, and use tolls to help finance it.

Other Comments

You listen, but you don't want to hear us!

Comment #22

Other Comments:
NO!

Comment #23

Noise/Lids

2. Park: Cross Trail over at 42 to the south, then cross back over lid before bridge
3. Tolls directed to lids - fund

Pedestrian/Bicycle

1. Put on freeway side not residential side thus moving “traffic” thru neighborhoods. Security wouldn’t be an issue then.

Other Comments

Bridge – put high-use in middle, thus lowering 520 east, perhaps eliminating sound wall, Shouldn’t sound wall curve in for noise refraction both onto freeway.

Comment #24

Other Comments

Target toll money on lids – then Kirkland and other north Point of traffic could help mediate the noise they are helping make. Also study more high-rise in middle of lake thus could lower 520 and sound wall could partially be eliminated.

Comment #25

Noise/Lids

1. These questions on details are irrelevant to the central question.

Other Comments

None of the “solutions” solve the problem. All your cost estimates are low by factors of two, three, or more. Why continue fooling the public and yourselves?

Appendix C, Workshop Participants and Project Team

Workshop Participants	
Name	Affiliation
Adams, Nancy	Homeowner
Albert, Gordon E.	
Andrews, Bob	Hunts Point
Andrews, Helen	Medina Resident
Andrews, Mary	Clyde Hill Resident
Arnold, Elizabeth	Resident
Baker Quinn, Barbara	
Baker, Christine	Resident
Baker, Mike	
Barbee, James	TRUST
Barer, Arnold	
Barer, Carol	
Berry, Jeanne	Mayor, Town of Yarrow Point
Boeltcher, Jeri	Hunts Point Council Member
Boeltcher, William	
Brazen, Joseph	Homeowner
Bremlin, Harry	
Broback, John	
Broback, Steve	
Brooks, Wiley	Medina
Brown, Charles	
Brown, Jacquie	Homeowner
Brusselback, Marian	Resident
Bryne, Marie	Medina Resident
Burnett, William	
Carter, RF	Homeowner
Clapp, Christine	
Clyne, Sandy	
Cohen, Suzanne	
Coleman, Dan	Evergreen
Coleman, Sally Sue	Evergreen
Del Beree, Jeanne	Homeowner
Demitriades, Paul B.	City of Medina Council
Dickerson, Lori	Owner
Diefrid, Arthur	
Dotson, Bennie	
Dotson, Patricia	
Eldrenkamp, Matt	Medina
Elliott, Bud	
Elliott, Janet	
Fade, Kristin	Resident

Workshop Participants	
Name	Affiliation
Fade, Susan	Medina
Finnelly, Laurie	Hunts Point Citizen Committee
Foster, Tere	
Gilbert, Sue	Medina Resident
Hart, Gus	
Heath, Randy	Yarrow Point
Heathcote, Celia & Peter	Resident
Hershberger, Robert	Resident
Hiejer, Jill	Hunts Point
Hilfinger, Laila	
Hill, Merle	Homeowner
Holland, Marcia	
Hunter, Ross	Owner
Jackson, Allen	Resident
Jackson, Joan	Resident
Kern, Gerard	Resident
Lindblom, Mike	Seattle Times
Loeser, Karen	Resident
MacIsaac, Jim	Citizen Advisory Committee
Madden, Dale	Hunts Point
Madden, Donna	Hunts Point
Mattern, David	
McDonald, Dan	State Senator
McGaugh, Pat	Owner 3
McGlenn, Ronni	Wetherill Nature Preserve & Yarrow Point Homeowner
McGraw, Jim	Medina Park Board
McKenna, Rob	King County Council
McKnight, Anna Marie	Hunts Point
Meden, Gwynn	
Meeham, Irene	
Meeham, Jack	
Minnett, Bob	Roanoke Park
Morcos, Alex	Medina Resident
Mowat, Mark	
Muloney, Patrick	
Murray Sargeat, Kamie	
Myers, Julie	
Newstrum, Elizabeth	Yarrow Point Citizen's Committee
Newstrum, Len	Yarrow Pt/Translake Tech. Committee
Nordstrom, Jim	Hunts Point Board
O'Bryne, Penny	Hunts Point

Workshop Participants	
Name	Affiliation
Odermat, Mary	Deputy Mayor of Medina
Owens, Richards	Owner
Pasma, Chuck	Bellevue Christian School
Paulman, Henry	TRUST
Preston, Laurel	
Pullen, Doug	Bellevue Resident
Quinn, James	
Ricketts, Reliance	
Robinson, Gordon	
Robinson, Jacqui	Resident
Rudolph, Bob	Medina Council
Ryning, Bob	
Ryning, Ginny	
Scherzer, Gabriel	Medina
Schroeder, Glenn	Homeowner
Schuler, Dean	Medina
Schuler, Terry	Home resident
Schulze, Doug	City Manager, City of Medina
Sharon, Steve	Homeowner
Sikma, Jack	Clyde Hill
Sinegal, Jan	Resident
Stengel, Gretchen	
Tate, Bob	
Van Luven, Steve	House of Representatives
Wasserman, Mitch	City of Clyde Hill
Wiseman, John	Owner 2857 Evergreen Point Rd.- Adjacent Property Owner
Yoler, Cynthia & Yusuf	Homeowner
Project Team	
Name	Affiliation
Brauns, Jeff	CH2M Hill
Cannon, Jennifer	EnviroIssues
Gilliland, Barbara	Sound Transit
Goldenberg, Joy	EnviroIssues
Hamstra, Tom	CH2M Hill
Hildebrandt, Dave	Parametrix
Hoff, Brad	EnviroIssues
Minor, Michael	Minor & Associates
Peacock, Jeff	Parametrix
Rubstello, Les	WSDOT
Serie, Pat	EnviroIssues
Wessman, Susan	Parametrix